(S)

(30)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No.3252 of 2007

Petitioner	:	Indra Kumar Dhurandhar S/o. Y.B. Dhurandhar, Age - 29 years, Address - Qr. No. M.E. -167, C.S.E. B. Colony, Korba (E) (C.G.)
		Versus
Respondent	:	Chhattisgarh Electricity Board, Through - Additional Secretary, Chhattisgarh Electricity Board, Raipur (C.G.)

(Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India)

Single Bench: Hon'ble Justice Satish K. Agnihotri

Present : Shri N.K. Chatterjee, counsel for the petitioner.
Shri Abhishek Sinha, counsel for the respondent.

ORDER
(Passed on 12th July, 2007)

The petitioner is working as Junior Engineer with the respondents/Electricity Board. Pursuant to the advertisement for appointment on the post of Assistant Engineer (Annexure P-2), the petitioner made an application. According, to the petitioner, the petitioner was selected in the written test and he was called for interview. On the day when interview was fixed, the petitioner was not permitted to appear in the interview.

2. Being aggrived, the petitioner has filed this petition with sole prayer i.e.

> "That petitioner's interview may be taken in compliance of call letter dated 6/4/07"

(31)

3. On perusal of the papers, it appears tha the minimum qualification prescribed for the post of Assistant Engineer is Degree/AMIE in Mechanical/Electricity/Electronics/Civil/Computer Science with minimum 65% marks from any recognized University. It was further prescribed that the candidates were required to produce final result at the time of interview, possessing minimum 65% marks in aggregiate after final result, failing which they would not be interviewed and their candidature would stand cancelled. Departmental candidates fulfilling the requirements as per the standing orders were also permitted to appear in the written test followed by the interview.

4. On enquiry as to whether the petitioner has obtained minimum qualification with 65% marks, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner expresses his ignorance and submits that this is not the case of the petitioner that he should have minimum qualification of 65%.

5. Be that as it may, the petitioner has no right to be called for the interview when he does not possess the minimum required qualification which enables the petitioner to appear in the interview as is clear from the advertisement itself.

6. The relief sought for in this petition is vague and as such it cannot be granted. The petitioner has not further indicated any right or breach thereof which can be enforced by this Court in exercise of extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

7. There is no merit in this case, thus this petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Indu